MINUTES

Defining Services Work Group Meeting #2
September 17, 2010 9:00-12:00
Office of Community Provider Network of RI

Attendees:

Agencies/Organizations:

Ray	Aresenault	Spurwink RI	x
Sue	Babin	RIDD Council	
Wil	Beaudoin	RIDD Council	x
Mitch	Carr	ProAbility	
Paige	DiBiasio	JRI	
Chris	Gadbois	Homestead Group	x
June	Groden	Cove Center	x
John	Haughey	Training Thru Placement	
Kathy	Hunt	Arc of Blackstone Valley	x
Lisa	Izzo	Spurwink RI	
Patti	Macreading	Trudeau Center	x
Donna	Martin	CPNRI	x
Ed	McDermott	Adeline LaPlante	
Raymond	Memery	RHD	x
Judy	Niedbala	Perspectives	x
Melissa	Reilly	ProAbility	x
Cheryl-Ann	Ring	Olean Center	x
David	Ruppell	Perspectives	
Patti	Shurtleff	Project Friends/Coventry	x
Mike	Smith	Cove Center	
John	Susa	Sherlock Center	x
Mary Sue	Tavanes	Fogerty Center	
Linda	Ward	Opportunities Unlimited	x
Larry	Wiedenhufer	LIFE Inc.	
Bob	Winters	UCPRI	

State Staff:

John	Young	Eleanor Slater Hospital	x
Daniel	Kretchman	Eleanor Slater Hospital	

Consultants:

John	Agosta	HSRI	x
Peter	Burns	Burns & Associates	x
Peter	Engquist	Burns & Associates	x
Jon	Fortune	HSRI	x
Mark	Podrazik	Burns & Associates	x

1

Topics Covered:

1. Introductions and Approach to Session   John Young
2. Brief Review of CMS Checklist and 1915(c) definitions   John Young
3. Outline Domains of Day Program services to consider   John Agosta
4. Review Service Definition Matrices   John Agosta

Comments/Feedback:

1. Responding to index card comment from Meeting #1 regarding providing assistance in the hospital setting, suggestion was made to consider an "interpreter"-like service to assist individuals in understanding their hospital visit/follow-up care.
2. Responding to overall approach
   a. The Department may need to consider that we are going to lose flexibility with the individual funding levels by using this approach
   b. Why are we moving the system into specificity of the n'th degree?
   c. CPNRI raises the concern that RICLAS is not part of this process
3. Related to the distinctions between individual services
   a. Some offered two service arrays—center based and supported employment
   b. Concern about too broad a base inhibits the state in measuring meaningful outcomes
   c. Why not have performance-based outcomes defined with less restrictive definitions?
   d. We need to start unbundling before we think about rebundling service arrays
   e. It is hard to shoe horn self-directed services into service definitions
   f. Recognition should be given to the fact that agencies provide a lot of these services at non-traditional times of day based on individual need
   g. For whatever is defined, there needs to be recognition of the needs of medically fragile individuals—either through staffing ratio differentials or staff qualifications
   h. Consider technology in support of delivering services
   i. Where to put transportation—inclusive of services or a stand-alone?
4. Related to ORS services
   a. We should be trying to braid voc rehab with BHDDH's supported employment offerings
   b. Issue with SE is often that the person that is most employable gets the least amount of support
   c. Need to maximize ORS's time-limited funding (tier 1- $1,000, tier 2- $2,000, tier 3- up to $4,500) over an 18-month period with BHDDH-paid services
   d. Service definitions should be thought of in a way so that they work in concert with ORS-covered services
   e. ORS should be at the table for these discussions
5. Related to the supported employment service
   a. Should include job prep, job sampling, job coaching (e.g. Job Club at Cove Center)

       b. Need to factor in that there may be an episodic need for reassessment
6. Related to center-based services
       a. Some believe it should be the service of last resort
       b. Others cautioned against stigmatizing center-based services; remember it is the individual's choice; not everyone will pursue integrated employment
       c. Future direction of center-based services should be think of the center serving more like a hub for other services versus a traditional sheltered workshop
7. Domains discussed for which the smaller work group will propose definitions
       a. Center-based (both work and non-work)
       b. Integrated employment (competitive, individual integrated, group integrated, self-employment, customized employment)
       c. Community-based non-work (volunteer, community service)
       d. Alternatives to work (e.g. school, artistic pursuit)
       e. Ancillary services (transportation, peer support, paying someone in the natural workplace, vouchers, technology, Chamber of Commerce affiliations)

Action Items:

1. BHDDH to look at options for more linkages to maximize ORS funding.
2. Subgroup of work group members to bring options for service definitions for day programs to the next meeting.
3. Consider the Employment First product (grant recently submitted) in BHDDH service definitions.
4. Consider the services related to meaningful day activities and supported employment already compiled by the DD Council.
5. Outreach to ORS to participate in these meetings.

Index Card Questions/Comments/Suggestions: